

EXHIBIT 4

SOAH DOCKET NO. 582-09-3064 and
TCEQ DOCKET NO. 2008-1888-UIC
consolidated with
SOAH DOCKET NO. 582-09-6184 and
TCEQ DOCKET NO. 2009-1319-UIC

APPLICATION OF	*	BEFORE THE STATE OFFICE
URANIUM ENERGY CORP	*	
FOR PERMIT NO. UR03075	*	
AND FOR AQUIFER EXEMPTION	*	OF ADMINISTRATIVE
AND FOR PRODUCTION AREA	*	
AUTHORIZATION UR03075PAA1	*	
IN GOLIAD COUNTY, TEXAS	*	HEARINGS

CONTESTED CASE HEARING

MAY 5, 2010

VOLUME 3

BE IT REMEMBERED that the above-entitled
matter came on for hearing on the 5th day of
May, 2010, A.D., between the hours of 9:00 a.m.
and 4:52 p.m. at the State Office of Administrative
Hearings, 300 West 15th Street, 4th Floor, Austin,
Travis County, Texas, before the HONORABLE RICHARD R.
WILFONG and the following proceedings were reported by
Dana Montgomery, Certified Shorthand Reporter in Travis
County and the State of Texas.

1 per 1,000 gradient reflected across that western
2 portion of the property, but in the opposite direction
3 of this measured data that's in the application.

4 A. But they were measured at different times.

5 Q. Oh, I'm sorry. So which condition is
6 representative of what's going on out there? This one
7 or the one you calibrated to?

8 A. I would argue the one I calibrated to, because
9 this one looks like it's been influenced by something.
10 It doesn't look like a natural gradient, you know,

11 Q. Okay. But this one is similar to the August
12 one, which also has the gradient from east to west, as
13 well. So now we have two sets of measurements
14 consistent with each other, but inconsistent with your
15 modeling. Correct?

16 A. So the August one I'm seeing a gradient from
17 BMW-9 across to BMW-20. Is that --

18 Q. No. If you look at the August measurement, it
19 shows from BMW, what, 7 or 8, there's a high ridge?

20 A. The heads are higher there, yeah.

21 Q. In fact, it's the highest on the site.
22 Correct?

23 A. On the map.

24 Q. Which represents the highest on the site in
25 the BMW area.

1 A. Yes.

2 Q. Okay. And from that high, the water drains to
3 the west as well as to the east, correct, according to
4 that map?

5 A. According to that map.

6 Q. And as well as according to Figure 5-3 dated
7 February 2009, the same thing from BMW-7. Correct?
8 Some of it goes to the west, some of it goes to the
9 east. Yes?

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. Okay. But you calibrated it to one set of
12 data that's not in the prefiled, not in the
13 application, that hasn't been provided to anybody that
14 we know of that shows an opposite direction, consistent
15 with your model. Right?

16 MS. NICHOLS: Objection to
17 characterization of who that data has been provided to
18 in discovery and otherwise. I -- I object to that
19 characterization.

20 Q. Okay. At least it's not in the application?

21 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Well, sustain
22 the objection as to the representation. You may
23 continue with your questioning.

24 Q. At least it's not in the application. Right?

25 A. That's correct.